

Message

From: Vranka, Joe [vranka.joe@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/9/2015 4:49:03 PM
To: Cirian, Mike [Cirian.Mike@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Anaconda Columbia Falls

Hi, Mike:

Although I had heard that Mark Chalfant was working on the 104(e) letters, I was not aware that they had gone out and that we had received some responses. Hopefully, the information provided below will bring you a little more up to speed if you have not been kept in the loop. If you need more detailed information on the enforcement activities, you can probably touch base with Mark.

Thanks again,

Joe

From: Sturn, David
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2015 10:15 AM
To: Vranka, Joe
Subject: FW: Anaconda Columbia Falls

Joe, below Dave Christenson describes the 104e the Denver records center received.

Thanks,

David Sturn
U.S. EPA, Region 8, Montana Office
10 West 15th Street, Suite 3200
Helena, MT 59626
(406) 457-5027
sturn.david@epa.gov

From: Christenson, Dave
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2015 4:02 PM
To: Sturn, David
Subject: Anaconda Columbia Falls

You answered my question on the ARCO 104(e). I wasn't clear whether you had document page association data or not.

We have a much smaller 104(e) (A CD or DVD, but just one disk) that came in from the PRP attorneys for Anaconda Columbia Falls Aluminum. It came in on paper (records center never saw it), enforcement (Scott Wilder in Seattle) had Toerek (ES contractor) scan it, and we got a CD or DVD back. The disk contains about a dozen PDFs with various file sizes & number of pages per file. The PDF file content was set up by which 104(e) question the pages responded to. It appears the scanning process sort of wiped the original page – document association of the paper 104(e) submission. We do have a paper copy of the 104(e) response that has many dozens of folders. Apparently each PDF from the scan contains several folders. That is most of what I know so far. I was just wondering about technical content details with the ARCO 104(e). It sounds like what you have is much better organized than Columbia Falls.

Reference the Columbia Falls site: You know, Columbia Falls 15 mi N of Kalispel, W side of Glacier NP. I understand the site is just about ready for NPL proposal. The 104(e) was to support the listing / anticipate PRP challenges to the listing.

Mark Chalfant is the attorney, Rob Parker is the site assessment manager, and enforcement (Scott Wilder) tells me Mike Cirian (RPM in Libby) is going to be the RPM once listing is completed.

The first I heard of any of this was 2 weeks ago when a dozen boxes showed up in the Denver Records Center with a coding sheet from Scott, through Mark Chalfant. I've been meaning to follow up, but this email is the most I've done since. Since Scott, Chalfant, & Rob all have copies of Toerek's CD from the 104(e), there isn't any urgency to get any of this into SDMS yet.

My first question is whether from a records perspective, this is supposed to be a Denver or Helena site? Thoughts?